



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/493,526

01/28/2000

Ofir Shalvi

TI-30149

2369

23494

7590

09/05/2006

TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED

P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999

DALLAS, TX 75265

EXAMINER

CORRIELUS, JEAN B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2611

DATE MAILED: 09/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

st

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------


20060830

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

As an attachment to the Examiner's Answer, please find a copy of PTO-892, art cited by the examiner.


Jean B Corrielus
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 2611

8-30-06



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

SEP 01 2006

GROUP 2600

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/493,526
Filing Date: January 28, 2000
Appellant(s): SHALVI ET AL.

Carlton H. Hoel
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the supplemental appeal brief filed July 05, 2005 appealing from the office action mailed April 05, 2005.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

No amendment after final has been filed.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,151,296

Vijayan et al.

11-2000

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vijayan et al. US patent No. 6,151,296.

As per claim 1, Vijayan et al discloses a transmitter (fig. 2) comprising a convolutional encoder 26 for receiving data values; said encoder 26 coupled to (concatenated with) an outer Reed-Solomon encoder 22 (see abstract); a bit-interleaver 28 interconnected with the convolutional encoder 26; a symbol mapper 32 interconnected with said bit interleaver 28. (Note that the limitation “for a CATV upstream data channel transmitter” is not given any patentable weight because it is only included in the preamble).

As per claim 2, the mapper 32 is a QAM Mapper see fig. 2.

As per claim 3, Vijayan et al further teaches a receiver fig. 3 having element 40 corresponding to the claimed scorer for receiving symbols; a bit deinterleaver 50 see col.6, lines 48-51 interconnected with element 40 corresponding to the claimed scorer and a convolutional decoder 52 interconnected with said bit deinterleaver 50.

(Note that the limitation “for a CATV upstream data channel transmitter” and “for a CATV upstream data channel receiver”, as recited in claim 3, are not given patentable weight as such limitations are merely intended use).

(10) Response to Argument

Applicant's arguments filed 7/5/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation “for a CATV upstream transmitter”, recited in claim 1, has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hiraio*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

In response to applicant's argument, with respect to claim 3, that Vijayan provides a coding for a wireless system rather than a CATV system and that coding in Vijayan is to counter multipath fading problems of wireless systems while a cable system has no fading problems rather impulse burst noise problems, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

Art Unit: 2611

However, for the sake of argument, contrary to the applicant's position that CATV system has no fading but rather impulse and burst noise problems, it is well known in the art that "fading or multipath" is a drawback in both wireless and CATV systems. See for instance, Ghosh et al, US patent No. 5,881,363, abstract and drawing figs. 1-2 that clearly show a fading CATV channel between the Head end 14 and users 12.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.


Respectfully submitted,


Jean B Corrielus

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2611 8.30.06

Conferees:



JAY K. PATEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER



CHIEH M. FAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER